

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the Finality of the January 13, 2005

Office Action.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of record in the January 13, 2005 *Office Action*.

Status of the Application

Claims 1-42 are all the claims pending in the Application. Claims 1-42 stand rejected.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection

The Examiner has again rejected claims 1-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Garg et al.* (US 6,625,603 B1; hereinafter "*Garg*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1, 6 and 10

The Examiner alleges that *Garg* discloses all of the features of independent claims 1, 6 and 10. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As discussed in previous responses, *Garg* is directed to an access control system for objects that operates within kernel 235 of a single operating system 200 of a computer (see FIG. 2 and col. 3, lines 6-26). Col. 3, lines 6-9 discloses that the *Garg* system (emphasis added):

should be implemented by a central module within the operating system in order to provide a consistent, non-redundant interface.

Further, Col. 6, line 60 - Col. 7, line 6 discloses that (emphasis added):

Object manager 225 maintains and manages **objects defined within the system**. Objects have properties that are typically used to describe

various aspects of the components **of the system**. Many different types of **objects may exist in the system**, and, in one embodiment of the invention, **each object is assigned two unique identifiers known as a Globally Unique Identifier (GUID) to distinguish it from the other objects**. GUIDs are 128 bit numbers and are guaranteed not to be re-used by another application. The first identifier is the Object Type GUID, which identifies the particular **type of object being managed by the object manager**. The second identifier is the Object GUID, which uniquely identifies the **particular object within a group of objects of the same type**.

When applications running in operating system 200 seek to access an object, the applications call service provider module 210, which checks with access control module 240 (col. 13, line 60 - col. 14, line 12) to review an access control list of the object (col. 8, lines 23-28). The access control lists contains USERIDs or GROUPIDs that are allowed access to the object (col. 8, lines 33-38).

Thus, it is clear that *Garg* only discloses the provision of an object or object type GUID within **a single storage system** 200, as the only disclosed purpose of the GUIDs of *Garg* is to differentiate the individual objects managed by the object manager 225 within that operating system 200. *Garg* completely fails to teach or suggest that these system-wide GUIDs are in any way unique **outside of the disclosed system** 200.

Thus, regarding claims 1, 6 and 10, Applicant respectfully submits that *Garg* fails to teach or suggest either a storage system, memory or method where an object and an object identifier are stored, and where “the object identifier identifies the object, and the object identifier is unique **within and outside of the storage system**” (emphasis added).

The Examiner seeks to overcome the deficiencies of *Garg* by arguing that: (1) “[t]he GUIDs of *Garg* has [sic] met the claimed limitations of claims 1-16, wherein the claim language states solely the ‘object’ identifier and not [sic] limited to a ‘user’”(O.A., pg. 11, lines 3-4); and

(2) “the term ‘unique’ is broad and fails to show how unique an identifier can be, hence ‘Globally Unique Identifier’ speaks for itself that it is an identification that is uniquely used globally. GUID does not differentiate whether it is unique only to one system and not the other or not unique across different systems for the term ‘globally’ is inherently known in the art and does not narrow down to one system” (O.A., pg. 11, lines 7-13). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding the Examiner’s argument (1), Applicant is not arguing that the recited “object identifier” is directed to a “user” with respect to independent claims 1, 6 and 10 (although such an argument is advanced, when appropriate, with respect to other of the claims discussed herein). Rather, Applicant is arguing that *Garg* fails to teach or suggest any object identifier that “is unique within and outside of the storage system.”

Regarding the Examiner’s argument (2), as discussed above, *Garg* clearly discloses the use of its GUID within a **single storage system** 200. While the Examiner cites various broad indications in *Garg* that its overall system may be used in a network environment, no portion of *Garg* is cited that teaches or suggests the use of its GUID (or any other unique identifier) “within and outside” of storage system 200.

Further, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s argument that “‘Globally Unique Identifier’ speaks for itself that it is an identification that is uniquely used globally.” Applicant respectfully submits that it is irrelevant whether the GUID is labeled “Global” or not. What is relevant in an analysis of *Garg* is what *Garg* discloses the GUID to be. In this regard, as discussed above, the GUID in *Garg* is disclosed only as being used within a single storage

system 200. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion that “Global” means anything other than global **within system 200** (at least as it is used in *Garg*).

Further, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s argument that “the term ‘globally’ is inherently known in the art and does not narrow down to one system.” Again, what is relevant is the disclosure of the form and/or function of *Garg*’s GUID, not the word “globally” therein. Further, this “inherency” argument is supported by no specific citation to a reference that supports the Examiner’s position, and the Examiner has not taken official notice that “globally” is so known in the art. Thus, this argument cannot support the current rejection.

Independent Claims 17 and 22

Applicant respectfully submits that *Garg* fails to teach or suggest a method or code for “requesting access for a user to a remote resource, wherein the request includes a subject identifier for use in making an access control decision, and wherein **the subject identifier is unique within and outside of the remote resource and identifies the user,**” (emphasis added) as recited in independent claim 17 and 22.

Specifically, *Garg* fails to teach or suggest any identifier that “identifies the user” and is “unique within and outside of the storage system.” Rather, the GUIDs cited by the Examiner as allegedly being “unique” **identify objects in the system 200, not users**. The only features in *Garg* that could be read as identifying users are USERIDs or GROUPIDs, which are not disclosed as being “unique within and outside of the storage system” in any way.

The Examiner seeks to overcome these deficiencies by arguing that *Garg* “discloses GroupID which is an [sic] user identifier indicating that the user is a member of along [sic] with

other users that has the [sic] similar access rights to the system” (O.A., pg. 11, lines 1-3).

However, Applicant is not arguing that no user identification is disclosed in *Garg*. Rather, Applicant is arguing that no user identification that is “unique within and outside of the remote resource” is disclosed in *Garg*.

Independent Claim 24

Applicant respectfully submits that *Garg* fails to teach or suggest a method of identifying a user comprising “sending a request for user information from the protecting reference monitor to the resource manager, the request including a subject descriptor for the user, wherein the subject identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID); receiving, in response to the request, the user information located based on the subject identifier,” as recited in independent claim 24.

Specifically, as discussed in detail above, the only identifiers of users in *Garg* are USERIDs and GROUPIDs, neither of which *Garg* indicates to be “unique” in any way. Further, *Garg* fails to disclose the recited requesting and receiving of information on users, as the tabulated USERIDs and/or GROUPIDs are used for access control.

Independent Claim 27

Applicant respectfully submits that *Garg* fails to teach or suggest an information storage management system where “the resource manager receives a user's request for access to the protected object, the request including a globally unique identifier for the user requesting the access, and in response to the user's request the resource manager sends over the communications channel to an external storage management system a request for information

about the user, the request including the globally unique identifier,” as recited in independent claim 27.

Specifically, *Garg* fails to teach or suggest the provision of a “globally unique identifier” for a “user.” As discussed above, the only identifiers of users in *Garg* are USERIDs and GROUPIDs, neither of which *Garg* indicates to be “globally unique” in any way.

Further, *Garg* fails to teach or suggest sending a request to “an external storage management system,” or using a received “globally unique identifier” to retrieve information about the user in *Garg*. Rather, as discussed above, *Garg* only utilizes USERIDs and GROUPIDs as a static security list for access control.

Independent Claim 30

Applicant respectfully submits that *Garg* fails to teach or suggest an information storage management system where “the resource manager receives a user's request for access to the protected object, the request including a globally unique identifier for the user requesting the access, and in response to the user's request the resource manager resolves the globally unique identifier to a user identifier recognized by an external storage management system; the resource manager sending to the external storage management system a request for information about the user, the request including the resolved user identifier; and wherein the resource manager upon receiving a response including user information about the user passes the user information to the access control unit; and based on the user information the access control unit determines whether to grant the subject access to the protected object,” as recited in independent claim 30.

Specifically, *Garg* fails to teach or suggest the provision of a “globally unique identifier” for a “user,” the subsequent use of a received “globally unique identifier” to retrieve information about the “user” in *Garg*, or sending a request to an “external storage medium,” for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 27.

Independent Claims 34 and 36

Applicant respectfully submits that *Garg* fails to teach or suggest either a method or code for accessing a protected object comprising “sending a globally unique identifier for a user to a name resolving device, and receiving there from information about the user,” and “sending to a storage management system containing an object a request for access to the object, the request including the information about the user,” as recited in independent claims 34 and 36.

Specifically, *Garg* fails to teach or suggest the provision of a “globally unique identifier” for a “user.” As discussed above, the only identifiers of users in *Garg* are USERIDs and GROUPIDs, neither of which *Garg* indicates to be “globally unique” in any way. Further, as discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion of any need to send an identifier to a device to receive information about a user in *Garg*, as *Garg* utilizes USERIDs and GROUPIDs as a static security list for access control.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 6, 10, 17, 22, 24, 27, 30, 34 and 36 are patentable over the applied reference. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that rejected dependent claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-16, 18-21, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31-33 35, 37 and 38-42 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Response Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
US Appln No. 09/465,514

Docket No. A7254

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-42 are allowable.
Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 1-42.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy P. Cremen
Registration No. 50,855